



ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Docket No.: 274099US41X PCT

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

RE: Application Serial No.: 10/539,590
Applicants: Marc DANEAU, et al.
Filing Date: December 29, 2005
For: METHOD FOR CONTROLLING THE OPERATION
OF A PROBE
Group Art Unit: 3742
Examiner: PASCHALL, M.H.

SIR:

Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Our check in the amount of **\$0.00** is attached covering any required fees. In the event any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Philippe J.C. Signore, Ph.D.
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 43,922

Customer Number

22850

(703) 413-3000 (phone)
(703) 413-2220 (fax)

Raymond F. Cardillo, Jr.
Registration No. 40,440

DOCKET NO: 274099US41X PCT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF	: DATE ALLOWED: 03/12/07
MARC DANEAU, ET AL.	: EXAMINER: PASCHALL, M.H.
SERIAL NO: 10/539,590	:
FILED: DECEMBER 29, 2005	: GROUP ART UNIT: 3742
FOR: METHOD FOR CONTROLLING THE OPERATION OF A PROBE	:

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

The “examiner’s statement of reasons for allowance,” included on page 2 attached to the “Notice of Allowability” (PTOL-37) that is in turn attached to the “Notice of Allowance and Fee(s) Due” mailed March 12, 2007, is mistaken in referring to the subject matter of allowed independent Claim10 as including “the output of the sensor utilized for supplying a correction signal to a detection module based on the sensor output” or that the claims (perhaps independent Claims 10, 15, 16, and 19) includes “sensing of the difference in the sensor output relative to a reference value to determine the failure or the integrity of the sensor.”

Accordingly, the “examiner’s statement of reasons for allowance” is clearly in error as to independent Claims 10, 15, 16, and 19 and should be modified in this regard to indicate the actual subject matter recited by these claims.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Philippe J.C. Signore, Ph.D.

Attorney of Record

Registration No. 43,922

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Raymond F. Cardillo, Jr.
Registration No. 40,440